



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,316	10/31/2003	Charles Lord	123528.00004	5459
25555	7590	10/11/2007	EXAMINER	
JACKSON WALKER LLP			EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q	
901 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	
SUITE 6000			PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75202-3797			2835	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/700,316

Applicant(s)

LORD, CHARLES

Examiner

Anthony Q. Edwards

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the handle being pivotably retracted **must be shown** or the feature(s) canceled from claims 6 and 16. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 9-14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. US 2004/0025993 to Russell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,616,111 to White. Referring to claims 1 and 11, Russell discloses a notebook computer protection device, as well as the combination of the notebook computer and the protection device (see Figs. 5 and 6), comprising a notebook computer (310), and a reinforced body member (320) adapted to both receive and secure a notebook computer therewithin, the body member (320) having at least one opening (not numbered) permitting access to a lateral portion of the received notebook computer while secured therewithin without manipulating the body member. See Figs. 5-8 and paragraphs 0033 through 0036. Russell does not specifically disclose the reinforced body member having a sleeve, since the body member covers only the top or the bottom of the computer. White discloses an impact protector for a hand held electronic device (see Figs. 1 and 2, as well as col. 1, lines 17-27), which includes protective portions (11 and 12) forming a sleeve to cover both the top and the bottom of the handheld computer.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reinforced body of Russell to include a sleeve, as

taught by White, since the device of White would provide protection to both a top surface and bottom surface of the notebook computer.

Referring to claims 2 and 12, Russell in view of White disclose the device as claimed, wherein the body member (320) has a plurality of openings (not numbered) permitting access to a plurality of lateral portions of the notebook computer while secured therewithin. See Figs. 5 and 6.

Referring to claims 3 and 13, Russell in view of White disclose the device as claimed, wherein the device (320) includes a plurality of extensions (356) defining openings (not numbered) therebetween. See Figs. 5 and 6 of White.

Referring to claims 4 and 14, Russell in view of White disclose the device as claimed, wherein the body member (320) has a port (i.e., area between top and bottom protectors) coupled to the sleeve and is adapted to receive the notebook computer and also to permit retrieval therethrough. See Figs. 5 and 6 of Russell and Figs. 1 and 2 of White.

Referring to claims 9 and 19, Russell in view of White disclose the device as substantially claimed, except for the body member comprising a translucent material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a translucent material for the body member, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Referring to claims 10 and 20, Russell in view of White disclose the device as claimed, wherein the body member (320) further comprises a resilient member (330)

disposed proximate the sleeve and adapted to securely cushion the notebook computer when received therewithin. See Figs. 5 and 6 of Russell.

Claims 5-7 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of White, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,208,504 to Cho et al. ("Cho" hereinafter). Referring to claims 5 and 15, Russell as modified discloses the device as claimed, except for a handle. Cho discloses a portable computer having a retractable handle (see Fig. 12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the protection device of Russell to include a retractable handle, as taught by Cho, since the device of Cho would provide a hidden, compact handle for the device of Russell that will avoid inadvertent latching onto nearby objects when not in use.

Referring to claims 6 and 16, Russell as modified, and further in view of Cho, discloses the device as claimed, wherein the handle is pivotably retractable. See Fig. 12 of Cho, which shows the handle (200) pivoting up (i.e., away from the case 100) and down (i.e., pivoting toward the case 100).

Referring to claims 7 and 17, Russell as modified, and further in view of Cho, discloses the device as claimed, wherein the handle curves outwardly from the body. See Figs. 14A and 14B of Cho.

Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view White, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,075,433 to Singer. Russell as modified discloses the device as claimed, except for the device including a security device adapted to alert when the notebook is removed from the protective

member. Singer discloses Bluetooth theft control device for small electronic device. See the "Brief Summary of the Invention." It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the protection device of Russell to include a security device, as taught by Singer, to help mitigate theft of the notebook computer of Russell.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Q. Edwards whose telephone number is 571-272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:00-3:30) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash N. Gandhi can be reached on 571-272-3740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

October 3, 2007
aqe

JN Gandhi
10/5/07

JAYPRAKASH GANDHI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER